DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 117 JC 020 185

AUTHOR	Zimmer, JoAnn
TITLE	Cross-College General Education Pilot Review Report, June 1997.
INSTITUTION	Sheridan Coll. (Ontario).
PUB DATE	1997-06-00
NOTE	20p.; Prepared with the Cross-College General Team.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.sheridanc.on.ca/acadserv/CCGErep.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Measures; Block Scheduling; Community Colleges; Diversity (Student); Enrollment; Foreign Countries; *General Education; Institutional Role; Internet; *Participant Satisfaction; Resources; School Schedules; *Services; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys; *Two Year College Students; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The three primary purposes of this report were to: (1) determine to what extent the Cross-College General Education (CCGE) pilot at Sheridan College (Ontario, Canada) achieved its goals of offering students choice of quality courses and access to all goal areas, including alternate delivery courses, and opportunities for student mix; (2) analyze the level of student and faculty satisfaction with CCGE; and (3) communicate recommendations for ongoing CCGE. A secondary purpose of this report was to demonstrate a collaborative process as a model for implementing cross-college change. A questionnaire survey was handed out to 582 students (22% of the CCGE student population) to determine satisfaction with CCGE and its various aspects, such as choice of course, selection process, time blocks, and student mix. Results included: (1) 86% of survey participants indicated they were satisfied with the CCGE pilot, and 78% found CCGE useful to them personally; (2) the most liked aspect of CCGE was the opportunity for students to mix with others from different programs; (3) the least liked aspect was the time block method; (4) although 63% of students indicated a satisfaction with time blocks, only 46% of students with the 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. time block indicated satisfaction; and (5) 28% indicated dissatisfaction with the course selection process, indicating a need for reexamination of the process. (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 117

Sheridan College

Cross-College General Education Pilot

Review Report
June 1997

Prepared by:
JoAnn Zimmer, Cross-College General Education Coordinator
with the Cross-College General Education Team*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

FC029185

*Team: Paul Angelini, Leslie Corbet, Marilyn Chalmers, Larry Comeau, Kathy Duguid, Mike Gibb, Lynda Graham, Bob Hookey, Kitty Hughes, Bob Jones, Richard Kadlec, Sharon Kiathavisack, Hal Mowat, Allison Petrie, Jo-Ann Shaw, Randy Smye, Judy Travis, Annie White, JoAnn Zimmer

In consulation with Merilyn Breen, Donna Barton, Rick Davey, Linda DeJong, Nancy Harries, Marg Lyons, Bob McCrudden, Diane Papaspyrou, Nancy Riddell, Allen Slater, Sandra Turnbull, Kathy Wood

Special thanks to Indu Shrowthi for the statistical analysis of student survey results.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iii

INTRODUCTION 1
- Background
- The Process
- The Review

REVIEW OF TASKS WITH SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

- Task 1: Planning 3
- Task 2: Scheduling 4
- Task 3: Course development and revision 5
- Task 4: Course selection process 6
- Task 5: Support systems and materials 7

STUDENT SURVEY ON CCGE 8

FACULTY RESPONSE TO CCGE 11

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 12

RECOMMENDATIONS 14

APPENDICES

A	Student Cross-College General Education Survey	
B	Community Services and Entrepreneurial Studies	
C	Community and Design and Computer Info. Management	
D	Access and Business	
E	Year 1 and Year 2	
F	Davis and Trafalgar Campus	
G	Timeblocks	
H	Most Liked Aspects of CCGE	
I	Least Liked Aspects of CCGE	

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Scope of Survey	8
2	Student Satisfaction	8
3	The Meaning of General Education	9
4	Key Recommendations from Students	9
5	List of Suggested CCGE Courses	10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Report

The three primary purposes of this report are to (1) determine to what extent the Cross-College General Education (CCGE) pilot achieved its goals of offering students choice of quality courses, access to all goal areas, including alternate delivery courses, and opportunities for student mix, (2) to analyze the level of student and faculty satisfaction with CCGE and (3) to communicate recommendations for on-going CCGE. A secondary purpose of this report is to demonstrate a collaborative process as a model for implementing cross-College change.

Interviews, focus groups and surveys with CCGE participants provided information on the five essential tasks associated with the implementation of the pilot: planning; scheduling; course development and revision; course selection process; and creating support systems and materials. Formal interviews and informal discussions with the College Scheduler, SILC managers, Assistant Director to the Registrar, Academic Support managers, staff in Academic Services, some Directors and Coordinators led to a series of recommendations. Focus groups with general education teachers and the CCGE Advisory Team led to more recommendations outlined in the Review of Tasks section of this report.

A questionnaire survey was handed out to 582 students (22% of the CCGE student population) to determine student satisfaction with CCGE and its various aspects such as choice of courses, selection process, timeblocks and student mix.

Student Satisfaction

Most survey participants responded favourably to CCGE: 86% indicated they were satisfied with the CCGE pilot and 78% found CCGE useful to them personally. The most liked aspect of CCGE was the opportunity for students to mix with others from different programs. The least liked aspect was timeblock. Although 63% of students indicated a satisfaction with timeblocks, only 45.9% of the students from the 3-6 pm timeblock indicated satisfaction. Results of the survey indicate a need to re-examine the course selection process (65% were satisfied with the process; 28% were not) and to consider course choices in the light of student recommendations.

Recommendations for CCGE

Recommendations for improving CCGE involve four major areas:
(1) on-going and future development
(2) more support from the College
(3) establishing, clarifying and finetuning processes
(4) communicating information and processes to appropriate individuals and groups

Implications of CCGE Recommendations: College Policies, Budget, Procedures and Roles

1. Impact on College policies and budget

Responsibility and Accountability for CCGE

A critical policy issue affected by these recommendations is the responsibility and accountability for the implementation of CCGE. General education is a provincially mandated

direction and part of program design. At Sheridan, the Directors (formerly Deans) have accountability for general education courses (General Education and Generic Skills Implementation Plan - AY93/94 and The General Education Progress Report -June 1995). This accountability includes cross-College general education courses.

Approval of CCGE courses

As part of its mandate, the CCGE Team approves CCGE courses, based on 1) specific quality standards/criteria established by the Team and consistent with provincial policy, 2) the balance of courses available in the goal areas, and 3) student interest. Providing peer support, feedback and creating PD opportunities, the Team works with colleagues as they develop and review their courses.

Recommendations that impact College policies and/or budget

- *change of course processes and advanced standing procedures*
- *consistent approach to block placement*
- *limiting the number of official course changes*
- *providing adequate resourcing for a CCGE Coordinator and staff support (Academic Services)*
- *providing resources for appropriate teaching/learning materials, PD, and new course development, including alternate delivery*
- *"special needs"consideration*

2. On-going Development of Procedures/Processes

Many of the CCGE recommendations influence College procedures/processes, since the success of CCGE involves participation from key people in different areas of the College. The main "procedural" recommendations include:

- *including CCGE in College timelines*
- *verifying and communicating scheduling information early*
- *identifying and communicating firm deadlines*
- *establishing and communicating consistent timetabling processes*
- *establishing a protocol for easy identification of CCGE courses from SIS*
- *establishing a process to accomodate student timetable changes*
- *improving course selection processes*
- *finetuning the Reg Office processes for data entry and early generation of class lists*
- *actively promoting CCGE information and processes throughout the college*

3. More Clarification of Roles

CCGE affects the roles of people/ groups around the College. Recommendations include clarifying the roles of the following in the implementation of CCGE:

- *the Registrar's Office*
- *CCGE Team: mandate and roles*
- *Academic Support Managers*

While significant communication challenges remain and will likely increase, the implementation of CCGE is proceeding as planned as we move towards full implementation in September 1998. As this report will highlight, the CCGE pilot has achieved its goals of offering choice, providing access to goal areas and opportunities for student mix. The CCGE Team will continue to provide on-going peer support for general education teachers. The focus on enhancing the quality of offerings will continue as faculty develop and revise CCGE courses.

INTRODUCTION

Background

General education courses are required as part of post-secondary program design. Sheridan has implemented general education in all year one and year two programs, according to Ministry requirements. With the Cross-College General Education (CCGE) pilot in January 1997, Sheridan has moved towards fulfilling recommendations that the College offer students choice of general education courses, access to all goal areas, including alternate delivery courses, and the opportunity to mix with students from other programs. These recommendations from the General Education Progress Report, June 1995, and the Curriculum Conversion Project, 1996, give a context and rationale to the CCGE pilot. When fully implemented at Sheridan, CCGE will offer on-going development and review of general education: quality criteria, breadth of courses, criteria for advanced standing and provincial accountability.

The Cross-College General Education Team

The CCGE Team is composed of representatives from each School and the Student Union. Meeting twelve times, beginning in May '96, the Team has accomplished its goal of developing an implementation plan for the CCGE pilot in January '97. The Team has created a set of value statements underpinning CCGE and has established criteria for CCGE, consistent with provincial standards. For the pilot, the Team approved thirty-nine courses from over sixty submissions from teachers across the College. The Team reviewed each course outline and provided feedback to the course originator(s), using established criteria. As well, Team members organized two PD functions for general education teachers, one in March and one in May.

The Pilot

In late November, 2600 students from forty programs chose their CCGE courses in the SILCs, from one of three, three-hour timeblocks scheduled at each campus. Courses filled on a "first come, first served" basis. The selection process was advertised ahead of time in the Sheridan Sun, in timeblock flyers distributed to classes by faculty and coordinators, and on the "message of the day" computer screens, the week before selections. The pilot included both Year 1 and Year 2 students. For many students, this was their first opportunity to choose a general education course.

Each timeblock offered nine or ten courses, including alternate delivery courses. Each course focused on a primary goal area, and all eight provincial general education goals were offered in each timeblock.

The Review

This review of the CCGE pilot includes feedback and recommendations from the various participants and collaborators: the CCGE Advisory Team, students, general education faculty, the College Scheduler, Academic Support managers, the SILC managers, Academic Services, Coordinators, Directors, the Registrar's Office and the CCGE Coordinator.

INTRODUCTION

Five documents provide the framework for CCGE:

1. General Education in Ontario's Community Colleges. CSAC. January 1994.
2. Summary Information on General Education at Sheridan College. March 10, 1995.
3. General Education Progress Report. Draft. June 1995.
4. Curriculum Conversion Project, 1996.
5. General Education at Sheridan College. Draft. 1996

The Student Survey

A questionnaire survey was handed out in March to 582 students (22% of the CCGE student population) to determine student satisfaction with CCGE and its various aspects such as choice of course offered, selection process, timeblocks and student mix. Attempts were made to survey students in courses from each goal area. However, the mix of students in each class is different, and some programs may have a higher representation than others. For School representation in the student survey results, see page 8.

Organization of the Report

This report reviews the five essential tasks associated with the implementation of the pilot: planning; scheduling; course development and revision; course selection process; and creating support systems and materials. Recommendations are included for each task, as well as action to be taken by specific individuals and groups of people. These include: the CCGE Team (Team), Directors, Coordinators, Academic Services (AS), Registrar's Office (Reg Off), Academic Support managers (ASM), general education faculty (Fac), College Scheduler, SILC managers (SILCs) and CCGE Coordinator (CCGE Coord).

Student survey results follow the Review of Tasks and list students' key recommendations and suggestions for courses. Next, a section on faculty response to CCGE cites recommendations from focus groups reviewing the pilot. The final sections of the main report include observations, conclusions and a synthesis of the recommendations. Appendices A-I detail the student survey results according to School, year, campus, timeblocks, and most and least liked aspects of CCGE.

REVIEW OF TASKS

This section reviews five essential tasks associated with the implementation of the pilot. These tasks include planning, scheduling, course development and revision, course selection process and creating support systems and materials.

1. Planning

Planning tasks for the pilot included such activities as deciding on pilot size and student mix, determining key processes, establishing values statements and criteria for CCGE courses, inviting faculty to participate in the pilot and establishing protocols for course selection.

What went well	*What needs improvement*	*Recommendations*	*Action*
• *Team created value statements around choice, access to goals and student mix* • *Team established criteria for CCGE courses, consistent with provincial standards* • *Team invited all faculty to submit courses* • *Team offered collegial feedback on courses to improve quality* • *CCGE Coord'r coordinated all processes and consulted with Team* • *SILCs and Reg Office were involved in early planning (June '96)*	• *some faculty didn't receive the invitation to submit courses, although it was sent in June and in August '96* • *confusion around pilot and the nature of CCGE in some Schools* • *cynicism from some faculty around notion of "more" change* • *lack of clarity around the role of the Reg Office in CCGE planning, inputting data and tracking info on SIS*	• *start planning early and involve key people across the College* • *clarify role of Reg Office in CCGE and include a Reg Office representative in CCGE planning* • *keep the planning process open and be as inclusive as possible* • *define CCGE Team roles more clearly to include more info sharing in each School as part of Team members' responsibility* • *consider "special needs" students in planning* • *improve communications around Registration processes so that faculty know ahead of time if the first day of classes is cancelled*	➤ *All* ➤ *Reg Off + SILCs + CCGE Coord* ➤ *All* ➤ *Team* ➤ *All* ➤ *Reg Off*

REVIEW OF TASKS

2. Scheduling

Scheduling tasks included establishing timeblocks, determining student mix, establishing courses, class size and teachers, allocating rooms and CRNs. Academic Support managers (ASM) figure prominently in this section.

What went well	What needs improvement	Recommendations	Action
• creation of a one page loading sheet, encapsulating all relevant info: code, CRN, title of course, teacher & room • student mix varied in each timeblock • establishing CRNs • courses and teachers established early • communication with SILCs was consistent and on-going • Team consulted with Faculty around timeblock preferences • on-going communication with College Scheduler	• constantly changing info around student mix created confusion • late notification to coordinators re groups in CCGE necessitated last minute changes • late requests for adjustments from Directors /Coordinators often could not be accommodated because of consequences on est. courses and teachers • info on last minute room changes sometimes not communicated to CCGE Coord., creating confusion • different types of scheduling with different Schools created confusion • fixed timeblocks created divisional constraints for faculty/classrooms	• clarify communication processes/ roles in scheduling • include CCGE in College timelines • verify scheduling info early (partic. Field/block placements) with Directors/Coordinators • identify and communicate firm deadlines • involve ASM in scheduling process and communicate all changes through email/voice mail to appropriate people • establish a consistent timetabling process with all Schools • establish a protocol for easy identification of CCGE courses from SIS • establish a process to accommodate student timetable changes (e.g. Students choosing options late in the semester, leading to timetable changes)	➤ All ➤ Direct'rs + Coord'rs ➤ Directors + CCGE Coord + ASM ➤ See above ➤ Scheduler + ASM ➤ Scheduler + Directors + ASM ➤ ASM ➤ SILCs + CCGE Coord + Coord'rs

REVIEW OF TASKS

3. Course development and revision

The Team decided on CCGE courses to be offered, using values statements, established criteria and student input from the Student Opinion Survey, May 1996. The Team issued invitations to all faculty to submit course outlines for Team feedback and approval. The Team provided each course originator(s) with feedback and commentary (from at least three Team members, including the CCGE Coordinator). Teachers resubmitted their course outlines to be signed by the Coordinator, as requested by the Team. Because of faculty requests for on-going PD, the Team has provided two PD opportunities, one in March and one in May, for general education faculty.

What went well	What needs improvement	Recommendations	Action
• Team developed a framework for evaluating course outlines • Team accepted at least one course submission from each faculty • Team provided helpful feedback to teachers on their courses •positive reception of Team feedback from faculty • faculty made changes to course outlines • Team provided two PD sessions for gen ed faculty	• some course outlines need more development, especially around evaluation of learning outcomes • invitation to faculty to submit courses for did not attract "core" curriculum teachers to submit gen ed courses: e.g. Although students indicated an interest (in last year's survey) in such "arts" courses as photography and animation, no gen ed courses from these areas were submitted	• use recommendations from student survey in developing new courses • encourage college-wide participation in CCGE • broaden the base of faculty involvement in CCGE course development and delivery • provide PD as requested by gen ed teachers, especially around evaluation and course learning outcomes • provide on-going feedback to teachers on their courses and course revisions	➤ Fac. + Team ➤Directors +CCGE Coord + Team ➤Directors +CCGE Coord + Team ➤ Team + CCGE Coord ➤ Team + CCGE Coord

REVIEW OF TASKS

4. Course Selection Process

The course selection process included informing students in advance what the CCGE options were and developing a process for them to register for CCGE. The SILCs were instrumental in this task as all CCGE registration took place in the SILCs in November, with the assistance of Academic Services. The SILCs also handled all student changes, and produced class lists before classes.

What went well	What needs improvement	Recommendations	Action
• Info on CCGE Options was given in advance to students • students selected early, in November • process in place to quickly register students for courses: use of "stickies" and confirmation sheets made up ahead of time • students on coop were informed of selections by coordinators/ Reg. Office • over 80% of students registered in Nov. • class lists produced in advance by SILCs and distributed to teachers before January.	• changing timetables: students selected based on one timetable; then some timetables changed, creating confusion • last minute timetable changes meant that some of the information mailed out to students was incorrect • confusion around a "change" process in January • initially long line-up for course selections • confusion around opening time for course selection day at Trafalgar • class lists returned to Reg. Office were cumbersome • data entry by Reg. Office not completed until late January/Feb	• clarify and communicate change of course process and advanced standing procedures • limit number of official course changes: communicate information to students • investigate methods of course selection to avoid long line-ups and waits • include a person from the Reg. Office in the course selection process • Reg Office to develop processes for efficient data entry, rapid identification of students' program and early generation of class lists • if on-site course selection is held in the SILCs, begin registration process earlier than 9 a.m. • coordinators to communicate special requests ahead of time to CCGE Coordinator (e.g. Development GAS students required two CCGE courses)	➤ SILCs ➤ SILCs ➤ SILCs + CCGE Coord ➤ Reg Off ➤ Reg Off ➤ SILCs ➤ Coords + CCGE Coord

REVIEW OF TASKS

5. Creating Support Systems and Materials

Support systems created processes for creating, distributing and tracking information related to the pilot. Materials for CCGE were developed by Academic Services and the CCGE Coordinator. The SILCs, Academic Support managers (ASM), the Library, Coordinators and the Student Union distributed information in advance to students. CCGE course outlines were mounted on the Web by Academic Services (AS) in February/March.

What went well	What needs improvement	Recommendations	Action
• professional-looking printed material, colour - coded timeblocks created by AS • enlarged timeblocks clarified info • cooperative effort in distributing info • articles in The Sun and on-screen computer messages informed students on CCGE • most course outlines on the Web by March • contact person in AS collected and tracked info, coordinated book orders and course outlines submissions	• process for collecting course outlines on disk needs fine-tuning • different templates for different schools created inconsistency in course outlines	• plan early and use a team approach • actively promote CCGE: - in the Student Tracker - on a gen ed Web page - through articles in the Sun -through student participation on the Team -through print materials -through "message of the day" screens (IT) • move to a consistent course outline template • continue support help for CCGE through AS • develop a process with ASM to flag CCGE on standard program forms • establish and confirm timelines with teachers for course outline submissions • teachers to submit latest course outline version on disk for mounting on the Web	➤ All ➤ CCGE Coord + AS + SILCs + Team ➤ AS + CCGE Coord +Directors ➤ AS ➤ ASM + CCGE Coord ➤ Team + CCGE Coord ➤ CCGE + Fac. + AS

STUDENT SURVEY ON CCGE

The student survey was administered in March 1997, to assess student satisfaction with CCGE and its various aspects such as choice of courses offered, selection process, timeblocks and student mix.

The survey (See Appendix A) consists of a combination of open and closed questions. Closed questions offered 5 or 6 options to measure the degree of interest and student satisfaction. Space was provided for additional student comments for each question. Figure 1 outlines the scope of the student survey.

Figure 1

Scope of the Survey

Total CCGE Student Population = 2600	Total Number of students surveyed = 582 or 22.3 % of total CCGE student population	
Year	73% from Year 1	27% from year 2
Campus	59% from Davis Campus	41% from Trafalgar Campus
Timeblock	40% from 8 am-11 am 22% from 12 pm-3 pm 38% from 3 pm-6 pm	
School Representation in Survey	32.5% ~ Business 22% ~ Comm Services 13.9% ~ Entrepreneurial	12.5% ~ Comm & Design 9.1% ~ Access 4.0 % ~ Computer Info. .3% ~ Arts & Design

Options on the student survey included: very satisfied, quite satisfied, somewhat satisfied and not satisfied. For the purposes of this report, we have combined the levels of satisfaction into two levels: S (satisfied) and NS (not satisfied).

Summary of Findings

Figure 2 outlines the general levels of student satisfaction with CCGE. For more detailed information according to Schools, see Appendices A-I.

Figure 2

Student Satisfaction

• 86% satisfied with CCGE • 14% not satisfied	• 82% found mixing with other program useful • 17% found it not useful
• 65% satisfied with course select. Process • 28% not satisfied	• 78% found CCGE useful to them personally • 21% did not find it useful
• 69% satisfied with course choices • 26% not satisfied	• 63% satisfied with timeblock • 36% not satisfied
• most liked aspect of CCGE was student mix	• least liked aspect of CCGE was timeblock

STUDENT SURVEY ON CCGE

Three open questions on the student survey provided us with information on:

- the meaning of general education to students
- key recommendations around the pilot
- suggestions for future course offerings

Figure 3

The Meaning of General Education

1. What does general education mean to students? Approximately 90% of the students who responded to this question described the concept of general education as "positive" for students.
Most common responses included the following: • an opportunity to learn something different, something unrelated to program content • a "break" in set classes, an opportunity to learn something of interest, set by you, not the program curriculum • useful, common and relevant knowledge, related to everyday issues and problems of the world • courses to expand people's minds by providing different perspectives, to develop insight and provide help for life's challenges • choice and variety to take something different, something interesting that you like, but might not have a change to take in your program • interacting with others and performing tasks different from program tasks • learning more than just one thing at college • a balance between specific program content and focus; a more rounded education • designed for all students, useful to everyone from all programs • a place to develop skills for life and for the future
Approximately 10% of the students who responded to this question described general education as a "waste of time" because of these reasons: • not relevant to program • irrelevant, a time-filler • an extra course with a workload that takes time away from program courses
Approximately 15% of those who responded to the survey did not respond to this question.

Figure 4

Key Recommendations from Students for CCGE

Davis	Trafalgar
• include more choices in gen ed selections • include more relevant course choices related to the student interests and programs • increase flexibility around timeblocks: choice of timeblock; different timeblock; shorter timeblock • increase flexibility of selection process: for example, have students choose courses electronically	Same as Davis with the addition of: • duplicate popular courses • improve communications around CCGE: some students received advanced information; some did not • increase accuracy of course outlines so that they reflect a clear picture of the cou

STUDENT SURVEY ON CCGE

Figure 5

List (and Frequency) of Most Commonly Suggested Courses

Suggested Courses	At Davis	At Trafalgar
Animals, Animal Ethics	✔ (5)	✔ (1)
Arts Courses: Visual Arts Pottery Painting Drawing Crafts Ceramics Print Making	✔ Hands-on stressed (18)	✔ (18)
Business and Entrepreneurship; Small Business Management	✔ (13)	✔ (3)
Computer Courses (e.g. Issues on the Internet); Impact of Technology	✔ (21)	✔ (6)
Criminology	✔ (6)	✔ (8)
First Aid	✔ (3)	✔ (3)
Fitness/Health/Nutrition Cooking	✔ (34) (4)	✔ (14) (5)
History, including Black Hist. Geography	✔ (7) (0)	✔ (5) (2)
Language and Culture, including French, Spanish, Japanese, German, Italian, Greek, Russian, Hindi	✔ (18)	✔ (16)
Leisure: Indoor/Outdoor		✔ (4)
Literature/Drama/Film	✔ Drama, Film Analysis, Writing (11)	✔ Creative and Fiction Writing, Media English, Literature, Journalism (18)
Math	✔ (3)	✔ (2)
Music	✔ (3)	✔ (3)
Photography	✔ (4)	✔ (5)
Psychology Sociology Philosophy	✔ (10) (1) (2)	✔ (9) (9) (4)
Religion	✔ (2)	✔ (4)
Sciences, including Anatomy	✔ (6)	✔ (7)
Sexuality	✔ (4)	✔ (1)
Structures: Political + Organizational Culture and Leadership Business Law	✔ (6) (6)	
Travel		✔ (2)

FACULTY RESPONSE TO CCGE

Thirty-four participants (mainly faculty members with a few students, one support staff and two directors) reviewed the CCGE pilot in March. In small focus groups, participants provided the following input. Most of these recommendations mirror recommendations elsewhere in the report.

What went well	What needs improvement	Recommendations	Action
• participants liked the following aspects of the CCGE pilot: ~ the enthusiasm of the teachers ~ opportunities for students from different programs to mix ~ students in different programs learning from one another: sharing different "program" and "career" perspectives ~ the large number of course choices ~ the selection process and registration ~ peer feedback on CCGE course outlines ~ sufficient lead-time to prepare courses ~ faculty learning experience from students	• late registrants (some students appeared in Wk 4) • no Reg. Office class list until late in the semester • the 3:00~6:00 timeblock meant many students left at 5:00 for work • process to access money for guest speakers/materials • challenges around students on block/field placement • communication processes with college community around CCGE • Registration Process for first day of Trim. was confusing for everyone as some programs told students classes were cancelled. CCGE were ready to run on this first day. • lack of information around course adds and deletes	• improve communications around gen ed in the college ~ clarify function, philosophy and provincial requirements for gen ed for college community • fine -tune processes and time frames for course selections and changes • develop high interest courses and include more sections of popular courses • provide on-going peer review of CCGE courses • review course titles and descriptions to appeal to students • inform teachers of block/field placements early in the semester • develop a gen ed Web page and an on-line discussion group for sharing information • establish budgetary processes for guest speakers, materials, resources • continue to provide opportunities for PD • investigate technician support or work-study students for some classes • investigate advantages/ limitations of offering yr. 1 and yr. 2 courses • explore potential for flexible scheduling	➤ Team + CCGE Coord.+ Directors ➤ CCGE Coord + SILCs ➤ Fac. + Team + CCGE Coord ➤ Team ➤ Fac. + Team ➤ Coord + CCGE Coord ➤ AS + CCGE Coord ➤ CCGE Coord ➤ Team + CCGE Coord ➤ CCGE Coord ➤ Team ➤ CCGE Coord + Sched'lr

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Student Survey Results

Appendices A-I represent the breakdown of student response by School,* year, campus, timeblock.

* Please note: due to small representation (sample size of 2), the Arts & Design School has been omitted from the tables.

Most survey participants responded favourably to CCGE: 86% indicated that they were satisfied with the pilot and 78% found CCGE useful to them personally.

Observations

1. The percentage of "satisfied" response is higher at Davis than at Trafalgar for the variables CCGE Course, Course Choice, Student Mix, CCGE Usefulness and Timeblock. The "satisfied" response at Davis is 'significantly' higher for Course Choice, Student Mix and CCGE Usefulness. Campus differences could be due to larger sample size at Davis (345) than at Trafalgar (237).

2. The percentage of "satisfied" response by Year 1 students is higher than Year 2 students for all variables. It is significantly higher for Course Choice and Student Mix. (See Appendix E.) These differences could be due to tendencies of Year 2 students to be more "career focused," and therefore make their choices from a different perspective. Sample size differences for Year 1 and Year 2 is much larger (Year 1= 423; Year 2= 154) than the sample size differences for the two campuses (345 at Davis; 237 at Trafalgar).

3. The most and least liked aspects of CCGE have been tabulated and ranked by campus, year and School. (See Appendix I) The most liked aspects of CCGE are Student Mix and Course Choice followed by Course Usefulness and Relevant Issues. The least liked aspects of CCGE are Timeblock and Course Choice.

Course Choice appears on both the most liked and least liked lists. This apparent contradiction could be related to the various interpretations of Course Choice. For example, did students actually like the course choices, but didn't like the fact they might not have received their first choice. Or did they like their choice initially, but were not satisfied with their course. Because of the general wording of the question, it is difficult to interpret students' perception of Course Choice.

Overall, Student Timeblock was the least liked aspect of CCGE. For 3:00~6:00 timeblocks, 85.7% expressed NS (not satisfied) while only 14.2% expressed dissatisfaction at the 12:00~3:00 timeblock. (See Appendix F.)The dissatisfaction with late timeblocks is likely consistent throughout the college, independent of type of course offered. Students with jobs or family responsibilities find late timeblocks difficult and leave class early to meet their other commitments.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

Although student satisfaction with CCGE is high, students have made recommendations to improve the quality of CCGE. We have integrated some of their recommendations into CCGE, Trimester 3 '97, by improving the course selection process (drop-off forms in the SILCs) and increasing the relevancy of the offerings (faculty surveyed students ahead of time; CCGE Coordinator consulted with Coordinators).

We will continue to integrate student recommendations into planning for January '98. For example, many students requested Japanese Culture and Language. As a result we intend to offer two sections of Japanese Culture and Language, one at each campus. We will also offer multiple sections of a new course on Entrepreneurship (another requested course), now being developed by a cross-College team.

Impact of the Pilot Review on CCGE

The CCGE pilot was successful in achieving its goals because of the collaborative efforts of many individuals/ groups across the College: the CCGE Team, SILC managers, the College Scheduler, Academic Support managers, the Registrar's Office, Academic Services, Directors, Coordinators, the Student Union, the CCGE Coordinator and general education faculty.

As a result of the student survey, consultations, interviews, discussions and focus groups with people involved in the pilot, the College has a set of recommendations to implement for the on-going improvement of CCGE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Review of Tasks section (pp. 3-7) in this report reviews the tasks of planning, scheduling, course development and revision, course selection process and creating support systems and materials. Individuals/or groups to take action are included with each recommendation.

These recommendations focus on four major areas: 1) on-going and future development 2) more support from the College, 3)procedures/processes involved and (4) communication of information.

1. *On-Going and Future Development*
- *Use information from the student surveys to improve processes and course choices*
- *Offer students "real" choice of courses with access to all goal areas, including alternative delivery*
- *Encourage participation of interested College teachers*
- *Broaden the base of faculty involvement in CCGE course development and delivery when appropriate*
- *Provide PD as requested by gen ed teachers*
- *Provide on-going peer review of gen ed courses*
- *Investigate various course selection processes (mail-ins, electronic, phone-in, on-site)*
- *Explore the potential for flexible scheduling*
- *Move towards full implementation of CCGE in September '98*

2. *More Support from the College*
- *for CCGE to succeed, the College must support and promote CCGE*
    - *by providing resources for a Coordinator and staff support (Academic Services)*
    - *by providing resources for some teaching/learning materials, PD, and new course development, including alternate delivery*
    - *by supporting and acknowledging the collaborative, on-going contribution of many cross-College individuals/ groups*

3. *Establishing, Clarifying and Finetuning Processes*
- *Start planning processes early and include representatives from each involved area*
- *Clarify responsibilities /roles*
- *Establish, clarify, finetune processes with SILCs, Reg Office, College Scheduler, Academic Support managers, Academic Services, Directors and Coordinators*

4. *Communicating Information and Processes to Appropriate Individuals and Groups*
- *Clarify communication processes and roles for CCGE*
- *Verify scheduling information early with College Scheduler, Academic Support managers, Directors and Coordinators*
- *Identify & communicate firm deadlines for course outline submission, for course selection, applying for advanced standing and course changes*
- *Actively promote and support general education across the College*
- *Develop a general education web page and on-line faculty discussion group for information sharing*

Implications of CCGE Recommendations for College Policies, Budget, Procedures and Roles

1. Impact on College policies and budget

Responsibility and Accountability for CCGE

A critical policy issue affected by these recommendations is the responsibility and accountability for the implementation of CCGE. General education is a provincially mandated direction and part of program design. At Sheridan, the Directors (formerly Deans) have accountability for general education courses (General Education and Generic Skills Implementation Plan ~ AY93/94 and The General Education Progress Report ~June 1995). This accountability includes cross-College general education courses.

Approval of CCGE courses

As part of its mandate, the CCGE Team approves CCGE courses, based on 1) specific quality standards/criteria established by the Team and consistent with provincial policy, 2) the balance of courses available in the goal areas, and 3) student interest. Providing peer support, feedback and creating PD opportunities, the Team works with colleagues as they develop and review their courses.

Recommendations that impact College policies and/or budget

- *change of course processes and advanced standing procedures*
- *consistent approach to block placement*
- *limiting the number of official course changes*
- *providing adequate resourcing for a CCGE Coordinator and staff support (Academic Services)*
- *providing resources for appropriate teaching/learning materials, PD, and new course development, including alternate delivery*
- *"special needs" consideration*

2. On-going Development of Procedures/Processes

Many of the CCGE recommendations influence College procedures/processes, since the success of CCGE involves participation from key people in different areas of the College. The main "procedural" recommendations include:

- *including CCGE in College timelines*
- *verifying and communicating scheduling information early*
- *identifying and communicating firm deadlines*
- *establishing and communicating consistent timetabling processes*
- *establishing a protocol for easy identification of CCGE courses from SIS*
- *establishing a process to accomodate student timetable changes*
- *improving course selection processes*
- *finetuning the Reg Office processes for data entry and early generation of class lists*
- *actively promoting CCGE information and processes throughout the college*

3. More Clarification of Roles

CCGE affects the roles of people/ groups around the College. Recommendations include clarifying the roles of the following in the implementation of CCGE:

- *the Registrar's Office*
- *CCGE Team: mandate and roles*
- *Academic Support Managers*